

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and Allowance of Claims 1-7, 10-15, and 17-20 in view of the amendments presented above and the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1,2, 4-8, 11-15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US Publication No. 20020144187A1 to Morgan et al. ("Morgan").

35 U.S.C. §103 REJECTIONS

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Morgan in view of U.S. Patent 6,628,417 B1 to Naito et al..

Claims 9,10, 16, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Morgan in view of U.S. Publication No. 20020184118A1 to Gronemeyer et al. ("Gronemeyer").

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Morgan in view of WO 0068793 to Miller.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 8, 9 and 16 have been canceled.

Claims 1-7, 10-15, and 17-20 remain pending in this case.

Independent Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to add the limitations that the inspector compiles examination data for the computer-based system and wherein the examination data is displayed by the computer-based system for user approval prior to connecting with the network addressable device. These amendments represent clarifications and do add further limitations to the respective claims.

CLAIMS 1-20 ARE NOT ANTICIPATED BY OR OBVIOUS IN VIEW OF THE CITED ART

The Examiner rejected Claims 1,2, 4-8, 11-15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Morgan and Claims 3, 9-10, 16-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Morgan in view of the three separate references listed above. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections on the ground that Morgan, either alone or in combination with any of the other references, does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed and, further, there is no suggestion in the references to modify the Morgan device in the manner now claimed.

THE MORGAN ET AL. PUBLICATION

The Morgan patent application publication discloses only a consumer network diagnostic agent whereby a user simply launches a diagnostics tool , which then performs the diagnostic functions and provides the results without further user interaction. (Page 1, paragraph 0009). The tool automates diagnostic testing and may be employed as part of a self-healing system (Page 2, paragraphs 0009 and 0010). Thereafter, the user may report the results to a technical support person. (Page 5, paragraph 0048).

THE GRONEMEYER PUBLICATION

The Gronemeyer patent application publication discloses a system for facilitating e-commerce transactions (Abstract). In operation, a user first opens a web browser. (Page 1, paragraph 0013). The web browser is then directed to contact a web site of a provider of goods and/or services.(Page 1, paragraph 0014). Then the web site sends the web browser a sentinel which inspects the user's "computing device" and determines needed goods and services. (Pages 1 and 2, paragraph 0015). This inspection of the user's computing device is done automatically and action is taken automatically. (Page 1, paragraph 0002).

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 11

In contrast to Morgan, Applicant's independent Claim 1 (as well as independent Claim 11) is directed, in pertinent part, to an enduser diagnostic system including an inspector linked with a system registry and a network addressable device wherein the inspector compiles examination data for the computer-based system and wherein the examination data is displayed by the computer-based system for user approval prior to connecting with the network addressable device.

Applicant's inspector 40 obtains configuration data from the system registry 26. Configuration data as used in the application refers to information required for configuring software and hardware components that define the user's computer system 20, preferably in real time. (Page 6, lines 27-32). Inspector 40 includes a repository 45 of diagnostic data, such as past solutions to error problems. From the configuration data and the diagnostic data, the inspector 40 compiles examination data, data deemed useful for assisting in the resolution of a computer-based system error. (Page 7, lines 18-28). Once generated, the examination data is displayed to the enduser prior to any examination data being sent to an external network addressable device 33. (Page 7, lines 29-32 and page 8, lines 1-5). That is, in Applicant's invention as claimed, the network addressable device 33 external to the user's system receives only the examination data approved by the enduser. (Page 8, lines

6-9). Thereafter, the external support resource 34 sends the enduser the solution to the error. (Page 8, lines 11-13).

No such system is disclosed or suggested whatsoever by Morgan and Gronemeyer either alone or in combination. Morgan discloses a device that operates without any user intervention or input to diagnose and solve a problem automatically and internally. Only after the solution has been effected is it suggested that a user may contact external technicians to report the results.

Gronemeyer, on the other hand, discloses a system whereby first an external system is connected to a user's computer and then the user's computer undergoes diagnoses without any user intervention or additional input. Combining Morgan's internal automatic system with Gronemeyer's external automatic system seems destined to failure. In any event, even if the combination were successful it still would not result in Applicant's invention wherein examination data is first collected internally, then approved by the enduser, and only then transmitted externally for the purpose of obtaining an error solution that is then received internally by the enduser to solve the system error.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that in order to combine prior art references or modify a prior art reference under 37 U.S.C. 103, there must be some teaching or suggestion in the prior art to make the combination or modification. In this case, the Examiner does not point to any teaching or suggestion in the prior art to add the approval of examination data required by Applicant's claims to the Morgan system, but merely asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gronemeyer with Morgan "Because the user can add information if it has been left out". (Page 6, paragraph 17). It seems that providing a user the opportunity to review the internal solution already derived by Morgan's automatic internal system is superfluous to Morgan's device. It is not clear, in any event, to Applicant what the Examiner is suggesting is the motivation here.

Most importantly, adding the review and approval of examination data as the Examiner suggests would necessarily change the principle of operation of Morgan's system. That is, Morgan is an already functioning technique for using an internal automatic diagnostic tool and adding the opportunity to review the solution prior to connecting with an external system, as the Examiner seems to suggest adding, is completely superfluous to the Morgan device.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that if the proposed modification of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art device, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. *In re Ratti*, 270 F. 2nd

810, 123 U.S.P.Q. 349 (CCPA 1959) (see MPEP § 2143.01 at page 2100-99, second column). In the present case, it is unclear to the Applicant what the Examiner proposes to accomplish by the addition to Morgan of the review and approval process prior to connecting to an external system or how it would cooperate with the existing system. It is clear, however, that if any such system is to be functional then the principle by which Morgan's system operates must be changed. Thus, in accordance with *In re Ratti*, it could not have been obvious to make the Examiner's proposed modifications.

The Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that independent Claim 1, as well as independent Claim 11, which requires limitations similar to those in Claim 1, is not anticipated by, nor obvious over, Morgan either alone or in combination with Gronemeyer or any of the other references and both are entitled to allowance along with dependent claims 2-7, and 10, and 12-15 and 17-20 respectively.

CITED BUT NON-APPLIED REFERENCES

The subsidiary references have been reviewed but are submitted to be less relevant than the relied upon references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-7, 10-15, and 17-20. If the Examiner should feel that any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or that a conference might expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Applicant intends this to be a complete response. No fee is believed due; however if a fee is due, please charge deposit account number indicated on the transmittal letter.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAFFER & CULBERTSON, L.L.P.

Date: 11 MAR 04

By: J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr.

J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr., Reg. No. 29,858
Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
1114 Lost Creek Blvd, Suite 420
Austin, Texas 78746
512-327-8932 or 850-934-4124

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: 11 MAR 04
Reg. No. 29,858, J. Nevin Shaffer, Jr.